

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 September 2011 has been entered. In this amendment, claims 1, 10, 20, and 29 have been amended, and claim 30 has been added.
2. Claims 1, 5-11, 15-21, 24, 29, and 30 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. With regards to the rejection of claims 1, 5-11, 15-21, 24, and 29 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the applicant has submitted claim amendments, and the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection.
4. Applicant's arguments filed 12 September 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to claim 1, it is argued by the applicant that Ginter does not disclose "restricting the one or more first usage rights." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ginter discloses that the VDE can securely deliver information from one party to another concerning the use of commercially distributed electronic content and that the VDE guarantees that all parties can trust the information because it is encrypted such that

only an authorized party can decrypt it (col. 14, lines 27-29, 35-39). Therefore, the encrypted rights are considered to be restricted because the use of the rights are restricted to only authorized parties that are able to decrypt the rights.

As to claim 1, it is argued by the applicant that Inoue does not disclose "communicating an indication of the restricting or blocking or deleting from the recipient device to the user device, the indication comprising the at least one received usage right" and that the right management server cannot be interpreted as a user device since the server is a central instance and does not perform the other claimed steps. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Inoue discloses that each of a restriction has a corresponding ID that is transmitted (0170, lines 12-20) and that right information IDs are registered in a database to correspond to right information (0168, lines 8-13). Therefore, the transmission of an ID is interpreted as transmitting the associated right since the ID is used as a representation of the right. Further Inoue discloses the right management server that receives the right indication also accepts user selections to define the rights and sets the right information (0172, lines 1-7; 0173, lines 1-9). The examiner notes that the claims only refer to the devices as a user device and a recipient device, and that the first nine claims steps and the last three claimed steps of claim 1 are not all explicitly disclosed as being performed by the user device. Therefore, the examiner has interpreted a terminal as a device that communicates rights, which includes terminals and servers, as disclosed by Inoue (0170, lines 12-20).

Further, as to claim 1, it is argued by the applicant that Kawell does not disclose defining and generating permissions. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The

examiner notes that these elements are shown to be taught by Ginter. Ginter discloses that a rights record is defined in a PERC (i.e. on user device) (col. 152, lines 45-54) and that a user (i.e. with recipient device) is allowed to customize their access rights by selecting a subset of rights in the PERC (0156, lines 18-26).

As to claim 30, it is argued by the applicant that the prior art fails to disclose where the recipient device "restricts or blocks" the at least one defined usage right and communicates an indication of this to the user device which then applies the received usage right until the expiry of the temporal restriction. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Inoue discloses that a restriction is given an end time (i.e. expiration) (0113, lines 5-10). Further, Inoue discloses that each of a restriction has a corresponding ID that is transmitted (0170, lines 12-20) and that right information IDs are registered in a database to correspond to right information (0168, lines 8-13). Therefore, the transmission of an ID is interpreted as transmitting the associated right since the ID is used as a representation of the right. The examiner notes that the restriction of rights has been interpreted as implementing right restrictions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 5-11, 15-19, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. (US Patent 5,917,912 and Ginter hereinafter) in view of Inoue et al. (US 2003/0005135 A1 and Inoue hereinafter) and further in view of Kawell et al. (WO 00/20950 and Kawell hereinafter).

As to claims 1 and 29, Ginter discloses a system and method for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection, the system and method having:

obtaining at the user device a first content encryption key (col. 12, lines 34-38; col. 49, lines 1-8);

obtaining the content at the user device from the protected content in accordance with the one or more first usage rights by decrypting the protected content by the first content encryption key in a first secure environment of the user device and by accessing the decrypted content in the first secure environment (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 21, lines 62-67; col. 22, lines 1-12),

defining at least one usage right at the user device, the at least one defined usage right specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or one or more usage permissions of the content at a recipient device and the at least one defined usage right comprising a temporal restriction (col. 152, lines 45-52; col. 156, lines 18-26),

verifying that the at least one defined usage right is a subset of the one or more first usage rights (col. 156, lines 18-26),

generating at the user device integrity protection information for the at least one defined usage right (col. 215, lines 43-51; col. 216, lines 6-8),

encrypting the content with a content encryption key (col. 215, lines 2-5),

obtaining at the user device a key encryption key associated with the recipient device and/or an operator of the recipient device (col. 128, lines 61-67; col. 129, lines 1-2),

encrypting the content encryption key with the key encryption key (col. 128, lines 61-67; col. 129, lines 1-2),

communicating the encrypted content, the at least one defined usage right, the encrypted content encryption key, and the integrity protection information to the recipient device (col. 126, lines 48-56),

restricting the one or more first usage rights in consequence of the definition and/or the communication of the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device (col. 67, lines 25-29),

verifying at the recipient device the integrity of the at least one defined usage right based on the integrity protection information (col. 215, lines 43-51, 60-63),

decrypting at the recipient device the encrypted content encryption key with a decryption key corresponding to the key encryption key (col. 210, lines 18-22),

**decrypting the encrypted content with the content encryption key in
a secure environment of the recipient device (col. 210, lines 22-25),
applying the at least one defined usage right to the content in the
secure environment (col. 53, lines 45-63),
using the content at the recipient device according to the applied at
least one usage right (col. 53, lines 45-63);
generating by the recipient device at least one received usage right
that is a subset of the at least one defined usage right (col. 156, lines 18-26),**

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

**restricting or blocking or deleting the at least one defined usage
right at the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction,
communicating an indication of the restricting or blocking or
deleting from the recipient device to the user device, the indication
comprising the at least one received usage right, without returning the
encrypted content to the user device;
applying the at least one received usage right at the user device after
the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until the expiry of the
temporal restriction;
abolishing the restriction of the one or more first usage rights when
the temporal restriction expires.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Inoue.

Inoue discloses a system and method for license management and usage restriction, the system and method having:

restricting or blocking or deleting the at least one defined usage right at the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction (0113, lines 5-10),

communicating an indication of the restricting or blocking or deleting from the recipient device to the user device, the indication comprising the at least one received usage right, without returning the encrypted content to the user device (0170, lines 15-21);

abolishing the restriction of the one or more first usage rights when the temporal restriction expires (0100, lines 1-10; -0113, lines 5-10; 0124, lines 1-5, 14-19; 0170, lines 15-21).

Given the teaching of Inoue, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Inoue by abolishing a restriction when it expires. Inoue recites motivation by disclosing that temporarily imposing a restriction on a user and lifting the restriction at the expiration of a time period allows for a parent to restrict a child's usage during a particular time, for example, before exams (0100, lines 1-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Inoue would have improved the teachings of Ginter by temporarily restricting a user and abolishing the restriction after a certain time in order to allow a parent to restrict a child's usage of content without completely blocking it in order to allow for dynamic usage restriction implementation.

Ginter in view of Inoue fails to specifically disclose:

applying the at least one received usage right at the user device after the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until the expiry of the temporal restriction.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter in view of Inoue, as taught by Kawell. Kawell discloses a system and method for distributing access to a data item, the system and method having:

applying the at least one received usage right at the user device after the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until the expiry of the temporal restriction (page 3, lines 23-24).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter in view of Inoue with the teachings of Kawell by applying a new right before expiration. Kawell recites motivation by disclosing that data may be lent by a library for a specific period of time in order to allow that the digital data may be transferred between multiple computers while ensuring a single instance of permission (page 1, lines 24-27), similar to a physical rental of a book. In the instance of a physical library, a book renter may return the book to the library prior to the expiration of the rental period, thus transferring back the permission to the library. It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter in view of Inoue by

restricting a right before expiration of a restriction in order to permit the user to return a borrowed item early.

As to claim 10, Ginter discloses:

at least a transmission unit and a processing unit and further a receiving unit, wherein protected content exists being usage restricted by one or more first usage rights specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or one or more usage permissions of the protected content at the user device (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 62, lines 15-17, 31-34),

the processing unit being adapted to obtain a first content encryption key (col. 12, lines 34-38; col. 49, lines 1-8) **and obtain the content from the protected content in accordance with the one or more first usage rights by decrypting the protected content with a first content encryption key in a first secure environment of the user device and by accessing the decrypted content in the first secure environment** (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 21, lines 62-67; col. 22, lines 1-12), **to define at least one usage right specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or one or more usage permissions of the content at the recipient device, the at least one defined usage right comprising a temporal restriction** (col. 152, lines 45-52; col. 156, lines 18-26), **to verify that the at least one defined usage right is a subset of the one or more first usage rights** (col. 156, lines 18-26), **to generate integrity protection information for the at least one defined usage**

right (col. 215, lines 43-51; col. 216, lines 6-8), to encrypt the content with a content encryption key (col. 215, lines 2-5), to obtain a key encryption key associated with the recipient device and/or an operator of the recipient device (col. 128, lines 61-67; col. 129, lines 1-2), to encrypt the content encryption key with the key encryption key (col. 128, lines 61-67; col. 129, lines 1-2), the transmission unit being adapted to send the encrypted content, the at least one defined usage right, the encrypted content encryption key, and the integrity protection information to the recipient device (col. 126, lines 48-56), and the processing unit being adapted to restrict the one or more first usage rights in consequence of the definition and/or the communication of the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device (col. 67, lines 25-29);

wherein the indication comprises at least one received usage right that is a subset of the at least one defined usage right (col. 156, lines 18-26),

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

the receiving unit is adapted to receive an indication of a restricting or a blocking or a deleting of the at least one defined usage rights from the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction,

the processing unit is adapted to apply the at least one received usage right after the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until the expiry of the temporal restriction.

**to abolish the restriction of the one or more first usage rights the
when temporal restriction expires.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Inoue.

Inoue discloses:

**the receiving unit is adapted to receive an indication of a restricting
or a blocking or a deleting of the at least one defined usage rights from the
recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction** (0113, lines 5-10; 0170, lines 15-21),

**to abolish the restriction of the one or more first usage rights the
when temporal restriction expires** (0100, lines 1-10; 0113, lines 5-10; 0124, lines 1-5, 14-19; 0170, lines 15-21).

Given the teaching of Inoue, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Inoue by abolishing the restriction upon expiration. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claims 1 and 29 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Inoue to the teachings of Ginter.

Ginter in view of Inoue fails to specifically disclose:

**the processing unit is adapted to apply the at least one received
usage right after the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until
the expiry of the temporal restriction.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter in view of Inoue, as taught by Kawell. Kawell discloses:

the processing unit is adapted to apply the at least one received usage right after the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until the expiry of the temporal restriction (page 3, lines 23-24).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter in view of Inoue with the teachings of Kawell by applying a new right before expiration. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claims 1 and 29 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter and Inoue.

As to claim 30, Ginter discloses a system and method for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection, the system and method having:

obtaining at the user device a first content encryption key (col. 12, lines 34-38; col. 49, lines 1-8);

obtaining the content at the user device from the protected content in accordance with the one or more first usage rights by decrypting the protected content by the first content encryption key in a first secure environment of the user device and by accessing the decrypted content in

the first secure environment (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 21, lines 62-67; col. 22, lines 1-12),

defining at least one usage right at the user device, the at least one defined usage right specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or one or more usage permissions of the content at a recipient device and the at least one defined usage right comprising a temporal restriction (col. 152, lines 45-52; col. 156, lines 18-26),

verifying that the at least one defined usage right is a subset of the one or more first usage rights (col. 156, lines 18-26),

generating at the user device integrity protection information for the at least one defined usage right (col. 215, lines 43-51; col. 216, lines 6-8),

encrypting the content with a content encryption key (col. 215, lines 2-5),

obtaining at the user device a key encryption key associated with the recipient device (col. 128, lines 61-67; col. 129, lines 1-2),

encrypting the content encryption key with a key encryption key associated with the recipient device and/or an operator of the recipient device (col. 128, lines 61-67; col. 129, lines 1-2),

communicating the encrypted content, the at least one defined usage right, the encrypted content encryption key, and the integrity protection information to the recipient device (col. 126, lines 48-56),

restricting the one or more first usage rights in consequence of the definition and/or the communication of the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device (col. 67, lines 25-29),

verifying at the recipient device the integrity of the at least one defined usage right based on the integrity protection information (col. 215, lines 43-51, 60-63),

decrypting at the recipient device the encrypted content encryption key with a decryption key corresponding to the key encryption key (col. 210, lines 18-22),

decrypting the encrypted content with the content encryption key in a secure environment of the recipient device (col. 210, lines 22-25),

applying the at least one defined usage right to the content in the secure environment (col. 53, lines 45-63),

using the content at the recipient device according to the applied at least one usage right (col. 53, lines 45-63);

generating by the recipient device at least one received usage right that is a subset of the at least one defined usage right (col. 156, lines 18-26),

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

restricting or blocking the at least one defined usage right at the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction,

communicating an indication of the restricting or blocking from the recipient device to the user device, the indication comprising the at least one received usage right,

applying the at least one received usage right at the user device after the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until the expiry of the temporal restriction;

abolishing the restriction of the one or more first usage rights when the temporal restriction expires,

wherein the restricting or blocking step, the second generating step, the second communicating step, the second applying step, and the abolishing step are executed in sequence one after another.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Inoue.

Inoue discloses a system and method for license management and usage restriction, the system and method having:

restricting or blocking the at least one defined usage right at the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction (0113, lines 5-10),

communicating an indication of the restricting or blocking from the recipient device to the user device, the indication comprising the at least one received usage right (0170, lines 15-21);

abolishing the restriction of the one or more first usage rights when the temporal restriction expires (0100, lines 1-10; -0113, lines 5-10; 0124, lines 1-5, 14-19; 0170, lines 15-21).

Given the teaching of Inoue, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Inoue by abolishing a restriction when it expires. Inoue recites motivation by disclosing that temporarily imposing a restriction on a user and lifting the restriction at the expiration of a time period allows for a parent to restrict a child's usage during a particular time, for example, before exams (0100, lines 1-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Inoue would have improved the teachings of Ginter by temporarily restricting a user and abolishing the restriction after a certain time in order to allow a parent to restrict a child's usage of content without completely blocking it in order to allow for dynamic usage restriction implementation.

Ginter in view of Inoue fails to specifically disclose:

applying the at least one received usage right at the user device after the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until the expiry of the temporal restriction;

wherein the restricting or blocking step, the second generating step, the second communicating step, the second applying step, and the abolishing step are executed in sequence one after another.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter in view of Inoue, as taught by Kawell. Kawell discloses a system and method for distributing access to a data item, the system and method having:

applying the at least one received usage right at the user device after the receipt of the indication from the recipient device until the expiry of the temporal restriction (page 3, lines 23-24);

wherein the restricting or blocking step, the second generating step, the second communicating step, the second applying step, and the abolishing step are executed in sequence one after another (page 3, lines 23-24).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter in view of Inoue with the teachings of Kawell by applying a new right before expiration. Kawell recites motivation by disclosing that data may be lent by a library for a specific period of time in order to allow that the digital data may be transferred between multiple computers while ensuring a single instance of permission (page 1, lines 24-27), similar to a physical rental of a book. In the instance of a physical library, a book renter may return the book to the library prior to the expiration of the rental period, thus transferring back the permission to the library. It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter in view of Inoue by

restricting a right before expiration of a restriction in order to permit the user to return a borrowed item early.

As to claims 5 and 15, Ginter discloses:

recognizing by the user device that the at least one received usage right relates to the at least one defined usage right (col. 55, lines 66-67).

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

using the content at the user device according to the at least one first usage right even within the time upon the expiration of the temporal restriction.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Inoue.

Inoue discloses:

using the content at the user device according to the at least one first usage right even within the time upon the expiration of the temporal restriction (0100, lines 1-10; 0124, lines 1-5, 14-19).

Given the teaching of Inoue, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Inoue by accessing the data after expiration of a restriction at a user device. Please refer to the motivation recites above with respect to claim 1 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Inoue to the teachings of Ginter.

As to claims 6 and 16, Ginter discloses:

wherein the step of communicating the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device is executed by communicating the at least one defined usage right from the user device to a rights server (col. 55, lines 39-43),

associating by the rights server the at least one defined usage right with authorization information indicating a rights issuer authorization for the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device (col. 55, lines 45-51),

communicating the at least one defined usage right and the authorization information from the rights server to the recipient device, and the recipient device verifies the rights issuer authorization based on the received authorization information (col. 14, lines 35-39; col. 55, lines 52-56).

As to claims 7 and 17, Ginter discloses:

communicating to a charging server an indication about the communication of the at least one defined usage right (col. 55, lines 57-61).

As to claims 8 and 18, Ginter discloses:

wherein an input unit of the user device D receives at least one instruction from a user for defining the at least one usage right (col. 16, lines 17-20; col. 60, lines 31-36).

As to claims 9 and 19, Ginter discloses:

defining at least one further usage right for at least one further recipient device for controlling the usage of the content at the at least one further device (col. 16, lines 14-20).

As to claim 11, Ginter discloses:

the user device being adapted to load the protected content via a receiving unit and to store the protected content at a storage and/or to store pre-installed protected content at the storage (col. 58, lines 57-62; col. 62, lines 64-65).

7. Claims 20, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter in view of Inoue.

As to claim 20, Ginter discloses:

at least a receiving unit and processing unit and further a transmission unit, wherein the receiving unit is adapted to receive the content being encrypted by a content encryption key, at least one defined usage right specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or usage

permissions of the content and the at least one defined usage right comprising a temporal restriction, a content encryption key being encrypted by a key encryption key associated with the recipient device and/or an operator of the recipient device, and integrity protection information for the at least one defined usage right (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 21, lines 62-67; col. 22, lines 1-12; col. 62, lines 15-17, 31-34),

the processing unit is adapted to verify the integrity of the at least one usage right based on the integrity protection information (col. 215, lines 43-51, 60-63), **to decrypt the encrypted content encryption key with a decryption key corresponding to the key encryption key** (col. 210, lines 18-22), **to decrypt the encrypted content with the content encryption key in a secure environment** (col. 210, lines 22-25), **to apply the at least one defined usage right to the content in the secure environment** (col. 53, lines 45-63), **and to use the content according to the applied at least one defined usage right** (col. 53, lines 45-63), **to generate at least one received usage right that is a subset of the at least one defined usage right for the indication** (col. 156, lines 18-26).

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

to restrict or block or delete the at least one defined usage right before the temporal restriction expires,

the transmission unit is adapted to send the indication comprising the at least one received usage right to the user device.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Inoue.

Inoue discloses:

to restrict or block or delete the at least one defined usage right before the temporal restriction expires (0113, lines 5-10),
the transmission unit is adapted to send the indication comprising the at least one received usage right to the user device (0113, lines 5-10; 0170, lines 15-21).

Given the teaching of Inoue, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Inoue by restricting a right before expiration. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claims 1 and 29 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Inoue to the teachings of Ginter.

As to claim 21, Ginter discloses:

wherein the processing unit is adapted to generate an alert if the integrity of the at least one defined usage right is violated and to initiate an indication of the alert at an output unit (col. 237, lines 33-37).

As to claim 24, Ginter discloses:

wherein the receiving unit is adapted to receive the at least one defined usage right and associated authorization information indicating a rights issuer authorization from a rights server and the processing unit is adapted to verify the rights issuer authorization based on the received authorization information (col. 14, lines 35-39; col. 55, lines 45-56).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SARAH SU whose telephone number is (571)270-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sarah Su/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/NATHAN FLYNN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431